(not to be destroyed)

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

Sec A 248-068 1:1-3, 10-18, 25-6 & 29-31, 8 Sept 07. 1917.

(Sec A)

File No. 2-19

Serial Nos. 1-4

Later references.

Sec A 2-19 Nos: 6-7, 8 April 1920

Sec A 15-20-709

Sec A 462.34 (1-2)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 4

Part B for February 1920

SUBJECT.

Petition from Mr. Rustum Ali Khan, Nirmali Nawab family, complaining of the non-disbursement of his share of pension

Sec: 4.

To

The D. C. Shimoga Dt. No. H 4620 of 5. 2. 1920

States that Govt. accept his recommendation and rejects the petitioner's request for a separate disbursement of the pension

No. H 4627 of 5. 2. 1920.

Forwards copy of the above to the Petitioner.

W D 1250—GPB—30,000. 28-1-19

Sec A 46/31 1920

G. R. S. III—1] 1919.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(SM)

NOTES.

File No. 2/19

FILE HEADING.

Honnali Nawab Family Pensions

From

Mr. Rustum Ali Khan, Honnali

No. Petn Dated 4.7.19 Received 8.7.19

Diary No. 75	Enclos. 1	Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Complains that the head pensioner — Mr. Shein Khan is not disbursing his share of pension (15) regularly & prays that a separate P.P.O may be issued in his name.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1) Draft — Submitted, forwarding the petn to DC Shimoga for enquiry & report for orders.

8/7/19

8.7.19

Sus

NOTES—First Sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SM File No. 2 of 1919

Serial No.	
2	To D.C. Shimoga, No M 431 d 21.7.19 Forwards the petition for report.
3	From D.C. Shimoga, No 59 d 11.9.19 Submits the report of enquiry on the petn of Mr. Ruthum Ali Khan. 2) The file containing the G.O. of 23.9.07 ordering the distribution of the share of pension (Rs. 15) to the petitioner – Ruthum Ali Khan is put up. 3) The Dy: Commr states that the head pensioner – Mr. Sher Khan has been regular in sending the money to the petitioner & the latter has refused to give him the usual receipt & therefore he is of opinion that – it is undesirable to issue a separate P.O. to the petitioner & 2) that – the petitioner may be directed not to style himself as Nawab (which he has noted in the petition submitted to Govt) & 3) that the petitioner may be ordered to grant receipt to the head member as he receives the stipend. 4) Submitted for orders. 5) The only object with which the petr prays for the separate drawing & disbursing his share

S

K. I. D. Petn

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

29/10.

29/10.

Serial No.

pension is that he has his own doubt as to the prompt continuance of his share pension to his heirs on account of the ill-will between the parties — The pension is payable for life of the present Nawab the Khan and not of the petitioner — as opined by the Govt Counsel —.

6) Name the pension scale of Pacha bi bi and Basin Bibi been separately registered. Recently Question regarding the continuance or lapse of such share after the death of the pensioner holders by name viz and omitted — Shukhan claimed their shares in pension to the heirs of the beneficiaries —

7) Pharn pension roll as the above printed will suffice

18
30/2019

8) The present head member of the Hamali Nawab's family is Mr. Sher Khan & the pension which he now draws & distributes to Sub-Sharers is a life pension liable

to

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SJA File No. 2 of 1919

Serial No.	
	to reduction after his death like other State pensions (G.O. dt 23.9.07)
S	c) On representations made by some of the Sub-Shareers as to the irregular payments of their pensions, Govt. have ordered in the cases of Mr. Wadeen Ali Khan, Mrs. Pateha Bibi & Badrin Bibi the separate registry of P.P.O's in their names. (G.O. No 7922-3 dt 12.6.09)
T (Linked file)	d) On the death of one Mrs. Pateha Bibi the ~~Vacant~~ pension which was ordered to have lapsed was restored to Mr. Sher Khan the Road member — for she ~~was~~ died heirless (vide G.O. No H 1728-9 dt 19.9.16)
U (Linked file)	11) In the case of late Badrin Bibi, Govt have ordered to continue the pension in the name of her eldest son — Abdul Ahmed Khan (G.O. No H. 4030-1 dt 29.1.18)
V (Linked file	12) Submitted for order with reference to paras 5 to 7.
	13) The request of the petitioners Mohammad Khan Khan Sahib Khan Sahib separate registered ~~registered~~ recognised incidental Vide above orders dt 12 6 09 (Key
T (Linked file	f) Directing separate registry of the shares of late Mr. Hassanali Khan &

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SW File No. 2 of 1915

Serial No.

Basu Lal — No 35 dd — Rpt:-
But the D.C. and Mr D.O. consider that the Nawab has not been really irregular in the payment of Mushaira due to the petitioner & that separate registry is necessary —

14) Rus Muhammad Khan was appointed and in possession of the estate of the Nawab during his minority, and his solicitor in applying for separate registry of his share is bound to contemplate the acceptance of his claim —. Nawab Gulshan does not admit his claim now —

15) In view of the strong recommendation of the D.C., the petitioner's request for separate registry might be granted. Whether any notice should be taken of petitioner's request the petitioner assuming title of Nawab, and whether he should be informed as desired by the D.C. is for orders —

16) Of course Rustam Ali Khan did pass rights for the amount claimed and if petition ill advised and misunderstandings

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

S.W. File No. 2 of 191 9

Serial No.

arise on this score, Auspd: are again approached by the the dispute, as per above registry will have to be recorded later on.

Secy)

U.W.9.

17 The Dy Comm's recommendation 1 & 3 may be appd. The Petitioner's request for a separate registry of his pension may be refused and he may be directed to give receipts for payments made by Mr. Sher Khan — the head of the Hamali family.

18 I think no orders are necessary on D.C's recommendation no 2 & the Petitioner may style himself 'Nawab' to gratify his vanity & Govt need not take any notice of it.

mrh 14-11-19

19 If it is necessary to Counsel the Chief Secy please place the file before him. mc

W. I agree with the D.C.

CSS 14/11/19

Dewan) Yr mrh 19-1-20

Yr recd 19/1/20

23-1-20

Secy 2261)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. [III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 2 of 1919

Serial No.	
22	Draft submitted for approval. LWL 29/1 30. 23 Issued, keeping a clean copy on file 31.1.20
4	Do D.C. Shimoga, M. 4626 dy 5.2.20 States that Govt. accept his recommendation & disposal. The petitioners request for a separate registry of the Jenmin etc. M. 4627 dy 5.2.20. Copy of the above to the petitioner.

B

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

8

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....75.....

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT
(SRA)
, the 191 .

Date of issue 21 July 19

Signed by W. Sreenivasaiya

Section SRA
File No. 2—19
Serial No. 2

No. RE 431

To

The Dy: Commr,
Shimoga Dt

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith the accompanying petition dt 4.7.19 received from Mr. Ruthum Ali Khan of Hunali Nawab Family complaining against Mr. Sher Khan Sahb about the irregular disbursement of his share of pention etc

(to be returned) ×

6

for favor of enquiry &
report.

Thanks,

Dr H Lawton

11th
5/7

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

W D 1744—GPB—30,000—19-3-19

P 1005

GPB—100,000—29-7-14

S+A 2-19-3

8123

From

13 SEP 1919

Jayarama Iyer Esq B.A., B.L.
Deputy Commissioner
Shimoga District

16 SEP 1919

To

M. N. Krishna Rao Esq B.A.,
Financial Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Dated

Despatched 7/11 th September 1919.

Received

General No. H.C. 59 (Rev) 1919-20.

No.

Enclosure No. 4. 16 SEP

Sir,

In reply to your letter no: Fe 431/S&A 2-19 dated 21st July 1919 regarding the request of Mr Rustum Ali Khan for a separate pension payment order for the sum of Rs 15/- that has been ordered in Government order no: Fe 1414-6/S245-06-30 dated 23rd September 1907 to be paid to him out of the pension of Rs 202/- granted to the Nawab of Honnali, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of the sub Division office,

letter no: 431 dated 13th February 1917 in which he reports that enquiries made by him show that the Nawab has not really been irregular in the disbursement of Stipend to Mr: Rustum Alli Khan and that the latter's application is really due to the ill will that he bears against the Nawab. I have seen the Nawab a number of times and he appears to me to be perfectly gentlemanly in his behaviour. He assures me that he has never been irregular and I am quite prepared to believe him.

Mr: Rustum Alli Khan's mother Asha Bi was a sister of the present Nawab's father and his father was a distant relation being the present Nawab's grand-father's sister's son as shown below:-

Nawab Abdul Wahi Khan

Nawab Kutbuddin Khan | Bada Bibi

Nawab Abdul Wahi Khan | Imman Alli Khan

Nawab Nasir Jung Khan (Present Nawab) | [illegible] Bi

Rustum Alli Khan.

3) Rustum Alli Khan was managing the present Nawab's property during his minority. Neither his father nor his mother seems to have enjoyed any pension and Mr Rustoom Alli Khan who was appointed in the will executed by the Nawab's father to manage his estate was asked to be given Rs 150/- per mensem and this has been sanctioned by Government. Though he has no claim to get any portion of the Nawab's pension, he has been allowed Rs 150/- and perhaps on the strength of this windfall, he is styling himself "Nawab" as can be seen from his petition dated 4th July 1919 sent to Government in which he has added "Nawab" after his signature. In a post card dated 8th August 1919 sent herewith for reference which was forwarded by him to the Nawab's Lawyer, he has again styled

himself "Nawab" I do not know if a person who cannot claim any relationship with the Nawabi family except through females is justified in calling himself "Nawab" when there is a direct lineal male descendant of the original nawab in the person of Mr: Shaikhan. I understand that he was an assistant Excise Inspector before the late nawab sent for him at the time of his illness and asked him to manage his sons property during his minority. If this person who calls himself a nawab even when he is getting Rs 15/- from the real nawab is given a separate Pension Payment order to draw this sum, there is no knowing what lengths he will go to. If he does not deem it derogatory, to get Rs 15/- out of the Nawabi pension, he ought not to deem it derogatory to get it from his

Mr: Rustum Alli Khan states in his petition that he is very much concerned whether in the absence of a separate Pension Payment order the pension would be continued to be paid to his heirs, but his heirs have no right whatsoever; for the sum of Rs 15/- has been granted only for the lifetime of mr: Rustum Alli Khan. The Nawab complains that though he sends Rs 15/- regularly every month to mr: Rustoom Alli Khan, the latter refuses to give a receipt and the post card referred to above is his reply to the Nawab's demand for receipts. Every payer of money is entitled to a receipt ~~and~~ a fortiori. So is the Nawab who has to deal with a person like mr Rustum Alli Khan who seems to be setting up an adverse title to the Nawabship ~~itself~~ itself and complains of irregular payments.

My recommendations are: —

(1) That it is not necessary, nay, that it is undesirable to grant a separate Pension Payment order to Mr Rustum Ali Khan.

(2) That Mr: Rustum Ali Khan may be informed that he should not style himself Nawab and,

(3) That he must pass a receipt to the Nawab whenever he receives the stipend from him.

The petition with its enclosure received with your letter under reference is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient Servant,

[illegible]

Political Commissioner

[illegible]

Copy of letter no: N. dis H.C. 431 (Rev.) 1918-19 dated the 18th February 1919 from the Sub Divisin officer, Shimoga to the deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District.

—

With reference to your memo: no: S. H.C. 280 (Rev) 1918-19 dated 6.10.1918, forwarding for report the petition of Mr: Rustum Alli Khan, a member of the Honnali Nawab's family, for the payment of his share of the pension direct from the Treasury on a separate Pension Payment order, I have the honor to report as follows:-

As per G.O. No: F.L. 1414-6 S.A. 248-06-30, Mr: Rustum Alli Khan has been receiving a stipend of Rs 15/- out of the family pension of the Nawab of Honnali He now alleges that the present Nawab Mr: Sherkhan is not regular in the disbursement of his stipend. He therefore prays that his stipend of Rs 15/- may be ordered to be

disbursed to him direct from the treasury on a separate P.O.

Mr Rustum Ali khan was the guardian of the present Nawab during his minority. Recently, however, some misunderstanding appears to have arisen between them. The Nawab, who was questioned on the point emphatically denied the allegation of negligence on his part in disbursing the stipend. The Nawab also pointed out that from time immemorial it has been the privilege of the head female to distribute the stipend to the several members of the family. This contention appears reasonable, and certainly deserves consideration. Besides, from the enquiries made by me, I learnt that the Nawab was not really irregular in the disbursement of the stipends. The petition really appears to be the outcome of ill-will between the petitioner

R 122
CHINNALI

INDIA
CHINNALI
9 A Registered
19

POST

WRITING SPACE

ADDRESS ONLY

H. Balakrishna R.
Pleader
Hon

THREE ANNAS
3A
INDIA POSTAGE

D 75

S&A 2-19-1

21

Fin Secy's Off
JUL 1915
09618

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore

Sir,

I, the undersigned member of the Honnali Nawab's Family, beg most respectfully to bring the following few lines into your benign Consideration and early orders.

1. I applied to the Amildar of Honnali Taluk on 24-8-1918 for the granting of a separate pensioner's Half for Rupees 15. which I have been receiving from Mr Sheir Khan - the pension Holder - according to the proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of mysore No. F.O. 1414-6 S. 248-06-30 dated 23rd September 1907; - On the Ground that Mr Sheir Khan is dispursing my share of pension irregularly & contrary to the above mentioned order and on the Ground of misunderstanding between myself & Mr Sheirkhan.

2. On my application the Taluk Amildar who has got the better information regarding the facts mentioned in my application, being a local officer, recommended to the Deputy Commissioner for the grant of a separate pensioner's Half to me.

3. I have just received final orders regarding my application till now.

4. The following persons were paid by separate pensioners' Halves in our family on the recommendations of the then Amildars of Honnali Taluk as per the Arbitration Award which was sanctioned by the Commissioner dated 8-9-1868. The original of the said order I have herein enclosed for your kind perusal & return:

(i)	Hussen Alli Khan -	Rupees 80.
(ii)	Fizu Beebi	" 37½
(iii)	Hassan Ali Khan	" 35
(iv)	Pacha Bibi	" 15
(v)	Basari Beebi	" 8.

5. I am not even in speaking terms with Mr. Shir Khan. In the light of the past Experience, both personal as well as that of the members mentioned above, resulting in utter prejudice to the interest of claimants in succession, I have my own doubts as to the peaceful continuance of my share of pension to my heirs.

On these Grounds I humbly request your honour to Grant me a "separate pensioner's Half" at an earliest date.

I beg to remain Sir.

Your most obedient & humble servant.

Hussain Ali Khan
Nawab.

Honnali
4.7.19.

Office Copy

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT,

Bangalore, Dated 5th Feby 1920

No. Fl. 4626 / SA 2-1924

From

M. N. KRISHNA RAO, Esq., B.A.,
Offg Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

S.Hiriyannaiyya, Esq., M.A., B.L.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.H.C.59-Rev.1919-20 dated 7th November 1919, reporting on the petition of Rusthum Ali Khan of Honnali Nawab family for the separate registry of his share in the family pension due to him from the head of the family Mr. Sheir Khan, I am directed to say that Government accept your recommendations and refuse the petitioner's request for separate registry. Mr. Rusthum Ali Khan should be informed that he should not style himself as Nawab and that he must pass a receipt to the Nawab whenever he receives his stipend.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

8.4.1-92

For Offg.Financial Secretary to Govt.

Memo No. Fl 4627 & 5/2/20

Copy of the above is forwarded to Mr. Rusthum Ali Khan for information in reply to his petition of 4.7.19 together with the enclosure.

For Fin Secy.